IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No.	:	09/847,883	: Confirmation No.:	5807
Applicant	:	Roberts, D.A., et al		
Filed	:	05/05/2001		
For	:	Low VOC Clean Room Cleaning Wipe		
Art Unit	:	1771		
Examiner	:	Boyd, J.A.		
Docket No.	:	05918P2 USA		
Customer No.	:	23543		

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
I CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER (ALONG WITH ANY PAPER REFERRED TO AS BEING ATTACHED OR ENCLOSED) IS BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITH SUFFICIENT POSTAGE AS FIRST CLASS MAIL IN AN ENVELOPE ADDRESSED TO:
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
ON 17 Nov 2003
Date
Geoffrey L Chase
(Type or print name of person mailing paper)
Geoffrey L Chase
Signature of person mailing paper

DECLARATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.132

Sir:

Dr. John A. Marsella hereby states the following:

1. that he is employed by the assignee in the above application, Air Products & Chemicals, Inc. as a research chemist having the title Senior Research Associate in its Corporate Science and Technology Center;
2. that he has reviewed the Office Action of October 22, 2003
3. that he has read and reviewed Pedersen, et al US 6,017,872 pertaining to compositions and a process for cleaning and finishing hard surfaces cited by the Examiner as a basis for rejecting all claims;
4. that the cleaning solutions of Pedersen, et al are based on an aromatic sulfonate, an ester sulfonate and a defoaming nonionic. Also, included in such cleaning solutions are aqueous soluble or miscible solvent materials such as lower alkanol (col., 6, lines 63-67)
5. that the presence of a lower alkanol is prohibited by the language "consisting essentially of" as set forth in Claims 20 and 23 because the lower alkanols would adversely affect

the wipe for use in an electronics environment by reason that it would emit excessive levels of VOC (page 2 of Applicants' specification);

6. that the ester sulfonates of Pedersen, et al where alkali metal cations are included would be deleterious in an environment for electronics manufacture; this fact is also shown in US 4,328,279 cited in Applicants' specification;
7. that Pederson, et al citation is not relevant to applications requiring ultra-low residues, in that they teach the use of ionic surfactants, which obviously would leave a residue
8. that Pedersen, et al although disclosing that no residue remains by the use of an ester sulfonate and aromatic sulfonate, refers to an appearance-based definition of low residue which is aimed at industrial cleaning and is not tantamount to the no residue levels relevant to electronics and semiconductor manufacturing required of the wipes claimed;
9. that the language "consisting essentially of" employed in Applicants' claims would exclude the ester sulfonate, the aromatic sulfonate and the lower alkanol of Pedersen, et al;

That all statements made herein of his own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true and further that these statements are made with knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issuing thereon.

John A. Marsella

John A. Marsella

November 17, 2003